

NASHOTAH
HOUSE
QUARTERLY
REVIEW

VOLUME 2

NUMBER 3

NASHOTAH
HOUSE
QUARTERLY
REVIEW

NASHOTAH HOUSE QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOLUME 2

No. .

Published at Nashotah, Wisconsin by Nashotah House Quarterly. Entered at the post office at Nashotah, Wisconsin as Second Class Matter under Act of August 24, 1912. Second Class postage paid at Nashotah, Wisconsin.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| The Dean's Letter..... | 4 |
| Eucharistic Ceremonial | |
| The Rev. Earle Hewitt Maddux, S.S.J.E..... | 5 |
| Four Illinois Prelates | |
| The Very Rev. Walter C. Klein..... | 14 |
| Inaugural Sermon | |
| The Rev. Wilford O. Cross..... | 27 |
| Seminary News | 32 |
| Obituaries | 40 |

EDITORIAL STAFF

The Rev. Robert L. Jacoby—Editor

George M. Minnix—Student Editor

The Dean's Letter

Dear alumni and friends,

At the bottom of this page you will find some interesting figures. They indicate that our Decade of Development Drive has made considerable progress without injury to the Daily Bread Fund or the Theological Education Offering. On the contrary both the Fund and the Offering show gratifying increases. If we can maintain this pace, the future we want for Nashotah is assured.

Hereafter at the commencement ceremonies the members of the class that is celebrating its twenty-fifth reunion will be invited to vest and form part of the procession. Some alumni have suggested this to me as a way of recognizing an important occasion, and I am very happy to adopt the suggestion.

Dr. Blackburn is collecting material for a full-length history of Nashotah House. If you have photographs, letters, lecture notes etc. that you are willing to lend or give to the House, please communicate with him.

Your affectionate dean,
Walter C. Klein

Daily Bread Fund

| 1959 | 1960 | 1961 |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| \$ 2,421.34 | \$ 2,788.90 | \$ 5,931.77 |

Theological Education Offering

| 1959 | 1960 | 1961 |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| \$25,047.86 | \$28,609.10 | \$32,054.86 |

Decade of Development Drive

| 1961 | | |
|----------------|----------------|-------------|
| Alumni Pledges | Total Pledges* | Received |
| \$34,485.00 | \$85,781.00 | \$51,700.20 |

*Computed from pledge cards actually received. In addition we have from various sources promises and prospects amounting to approximately \$550,000.

Eucharistic Ceremonial

EARLE HEWITT MADDUX, S.S.J.E.

I shall always be glad that the first priest I knew was a Greek monk. Papa Germanos had been sent out to Pueblo, Colorado, to shepherd a congregation of Orthodox, most of whom were employed in the local steel mill. When Papa Germanos stood at the Altar, one forgot the two pompous bull-frogs who served as his choir; the strange surroundings and the alien tongue went unnoticed. There the gates of heaven were opened wide, and one did not need to know the language, for Father Germanos lived always in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ. Not merely his lips, but his whole life gave praise to his Maker. It was never more apparent than when he stood at the Altar.

It was Father Germanos who showed me my first glimpse of the meaning of the offering of the Holy Mysteries. Through observing him, I began to become aware of certain basic principles which ought profoundly to affect every priest's offering of the Holy Sacrifice, whatever his Rite, or his ceremonial predilections. The purpose of this paper is to set forth these principles for our mutual consideration, and I shall use some historical matter and a few personal experiences as a framework on which to present them.

Christianity has never been a purely spiritual religion, because we ourselves are not pure spirits. For this reason, God the Son became Man that He might redeem the whole man. Therefore the religion which He gave us involved the use of material things, bread and wine, water and oil. It is obviously impossible to employ these material things in divine worship without some sort of ceremonial action.

In the earliest ages of the Church, when profession of the Christian Faith involved the danger (at the very least) of penal servitude for life, the offering of the Holy Sacrifice seems to have been a very matter-of-fact function, for which even the Bishops wore the ordinary street dress of the time. We do see used the sign of the Cross; we behold a ceremonial grouping of the Ministers.

It is a very great mistake to overestimate the austerity of early Eucharistic worship. From reliable secular sources we know that the devout provided precious vessels of gold and silver for the Liturgy. The beloved Dom Gregory Dix, in *The Shape of the Liturgy*, gives us a list of the plate owned by one obscure North African parish during one of the last persecutions, a collection which would do credit to one of our great metropolitan parishes of today. This age of the Church would remind us that **ONLY OUR VERY BEST IS GOOD ENOUGH FOR GOD'S SERVICE.**

With the conversion of Constantine, new churches were magnificently built and equipped. Divine worship emerged from its hitherto rather domestic setting, and the offering of the Liturgy took on a new splendor. Perhaps the first real liturgiologist was Saint Cyril of Jerusalem, who ruled his See for more than thirty years in the middle of the fourth century. The Bishops around the Holy City considered him very "High Church," as some would say today. On them he made little impression. But the Bishops of the next generation rejoiced to follow his lead.

Saint Cyril not only arranged a Calendar of Festivals for the then Mother Church of Christendom; but he also set the Liturgy of his Diocese in order. He is the first to mention incense at the Gospel and the *Lavabo* ceremony, two usages which long ago became universal. We may truly describe him as a Ritualist, but he was not interested in devising ceremonial for its own sake. Saint Cyril teaches us the second principle, **CEREMONIAL MUST BE AN EXPRESSION OF FAITH.**

It is interesting to note that subsequent developments in ceremonial grew out of differing doctrinal emphases. In the East the lawfulness of the veneration of Icons was called in question

hence the many censings of the Icons in the services of the Orthodox at the present day. In the West there were disputes about the Real Presence of our Savior in the Holy Eucharist, therefore our present practice of genuflection and elevation.

We Anglicans must always remember that genuflection was first ordered at Canterbury, five hundred years before it was directed by the Roman Missal of Pius V in the days of Elizabeth I of England.

We come to the Middle Ages for our next principle of liturgical usage. During this time the Ordinary and Canon of the Mass, certainly in England, became very cluttered with extraneous matter. One thinks of the three psalms, preces and three collects which in the Use of Sarum were on some days interpolated between the Fraction and the Pax. Lest we think that this sort of thing was confined to the Middle Ages, I well remember an early Sunday Eucharist where the Celebrant said EIGHT of the Occasional Prayers and a third Lord's Prayer after the Prayer of Thanksgiving and the *Gloria in excelsis* had already been said. Perhaps the special warning of this period to the Celebrant of today may well serve as our third principle, DON'T OVERLOAD THE LITURGY WITH MANY OCCASIONAL PRAYERS.

Then there is the symbolism of Durandus of Mende, who lived from 1230 to 1296. This truly learned and devout prelate saw symbolic meanings in the simplest acts. In his teaching he closely related the Mass in its various stages to the Passion of our Lord, with results that seem, after mature deliberation, somewhat startling. For example, the Priest washing his hands is to remind the people of Pontius Pilate washing his hands. This same teaching has found its way into some otherwise excellent Anglican devotional manuals, but God forbid that any of my actions at the Altar should remind any of the congregation of Pontius Pilate!

It is to this writer or his school that we owe the description of the Mass vestments as reminders of Christ's Passion. The amice is said to represent the blindfold, the girdle the cords which bound our Lord's hands at the scourging, etc. This symbolism is very late, and does not agree with the *Prayers While Vesting*, or with the formulae which the Bishops use while bestowing the various

vestments at the time of ordination. Of course we must remember that there are those who find Durandus' symbolism devotionally helpful.

However, it is better that we realize that the vestments are but the conventionalized dress clothes of our Lord Jesus' time. We priests wear them to remind ourselves that Christ is the True Priest, that we are only His representatives. The same vestments remind the laity that we priests are but channels of God's grace, and that Christ Himself is the True Priest. Another warning may serve as our Fourth Principle: **AVOID FUSSY SYMBOLISM.**

In this connection, something should be said for simplicity in performing ceremonial. Whatever ceremonial we use, let our doing of the Holy Liturgy be as unfussy as may be. Let each act of the celebrant and his assistants be performed in the simplest possible manner. **EVERY ACT, EVERY MOTION, EVERY GESTURE MADE IN THE SANCTUARY IS PART OF THE PRAYER OF THE MASS.** The realization of this fifth principle leaves no room for fussiness.

The liturgical overloadings mentioned above were of course swept away with the ordering of the First English Liturgy of 1549, but the things that mattered were retained. Greatly to the horror of the Calvinists, the Anglican clergy continued to offer the Holy Sacrifice, wearing the traditional vestments and using the ancient ceremonies. (In this connection it may be worth noting that the Lutherans at the time of the Reformation and for long afterward continued to use the old vestments and much of the ancient ceremonial, as they still do in Northern Europe from Finland to Iceland. In this country, and in many other lands, present-day Lutherans are beginning to recover the liturgical treasures of the Catholic heritage.)

The Second English Liturgy of 1552 ordered the surplice substituted for alb and vestment. Fortunately this Rite was not long in use, and with the death of Edward VI and the accession of Mary Tudor, the Latin Rite, the ancient vestments and many of the traditional ceremonies were restored. A few years later the new Prayer Book of Elizabeth I (1559) ordered by Rubric the retention of the ancient vestments and ornaments. This direction

was in many places studiously disregarded, but by this time our sixth basic principle, on which most of us are accustomed to act, had been established: THE PRAYER BOOK RITE IS A CATHOLIC RITE, AND IS TO BE CELEBRATED AS SUCH.

The long disuse of the Prayer Book in the days of Cromwell resulted in the development of a new body of clergy, to whom the older traditions of celebrating were practically unknown. Even so, the Holy Sacrifice continued to be offered, and the use of the ancient vestments and ornaments continued to be ordered, even though this Rubric was largely ignored in practice.

In its origins, the Catholic Revival of the last century, both in England and in this country, was doctrinal, rather than ceremonial. This was surely right. But the clergy of that day soon relearned the old lesson: Doctrine, if it is to be understood by the Faithful, must find an outward expression in ceremonial. And so our Fathers in the Faith became Ritualists. They were also called Rubricians as a term of reproach, because of their emphasis on the Prayer Book as providing a way of life. The same epithet was also applied to them because they attempted to base their ceremonial usages on the Prayer Book Ornaments Rubric. This Rubric was their constant and continuing authority for the restoration of eucharistic vestments and other traditional decencies of divine worship. We should remember that this same Ornaments Rubric is implicit in the Preface of our own American Book of Common Prayer.

Later there were two groups among Anglo-Catholics: one held that the old Sarum Use was the only proper source for Anglican ceremonial, and a somewhat larger body of opinion felt quite free to adapt from contemporary Latin usage. Some partisans of Sarum did their cause disservice by claiming that Sarum usage had nothing to do with Rome, a notion long since exploded. "Sarum Use" was simply the way in which the Roman Rite was offered in large sections of Pre-Reformation England. There is nothing Anti-Roman in either the Sarum Missal or the Sarum Breviary. Prayers for the Pope are a prominent feature; some of the Breviary hymns are very advanced in their Mariology.

During this period directions for performing current Western ceremonial were easily obtainable, while directions for a Sarum

presentation were difficult to come by, and were not based on a living use which could easily be studied by all who would. Proponents of then current Latin ceremonial usages often stigmatized their opponents as advocates of "British Museum Religion." This was scarcely fair and certainly ungracious. However, the Sarumites gave as good as they received, and called the other side "Disloyal" and "Unanglican."

There have been fashions in ceremonial throughout the ages of Christian history. In view of the variations in human temperament it would be strange if this were not so. Therefore we ought not to find fault with variation within reasonable limits, provided that the ceremonial does not become an end in itself.

Now let us say something about borrowing from other Communions. In a certain American city there is a Methodist Church which has long had a beautifully appointed Altar and Sanctuary, complete with tabernacle and reservation, and three sanctuary lamps, one of which is always burning. For very many years there have been the usual six Altar Lights; for a much longer period a handsome processional cross, flanked with torches, has been a normal feature of Sunday worship. This congregation is not exceptional from the standpoint of the liturgical revival in the Methodist Church. Indeed, throughout that body we find that there is an increasing use of devotional material and liturgical customs quite familiar to Anglicans.

Let us take another example from a very different part of the world. In the Near East, those separated Christians whom Adrian Fortescue lumped together as "The Lesser Eastern Churches" have for centuries borrowed extensively from the ceremonial usages of the Great Church of Constantinople. Things for which their own rites make no provision have been lifted bodily from the Liturgies of the Orthodox. Yet these truly devout Christians are by no means interested in becoming subjects of the Patriarch of Constantinople.

Anglican adaptations of current Roman ceremonial are by no means a certain sign that those who use them are planning to become Roman Catholics. Also, it is a very great mistake to attempt to equate the Book of Common Prayer with the Roman Missal.

The latter has very detailed directions for celebrating, preceded by a large body of General Rubrics.

However, the Book of Common Prayer, since it is a book for the use of the people, contains but little in the way of ceremonial directions. The places of Introit, Gradual, Offertory and Communion are indicated, but the texts of these anthems, with the partial exception of the Offertory, are not provided. Consider also the features of our public worship which are nowhere mentioned in the Book of Common Prayer. A careful search of that book will show that the rochet worn by the Bishop-elect on the day of his consecration is the only vestment specifically mentioned by name. Servers, crucifers, lay-readers and vested choirs; academic hoods, surplices, stoles, scarves and cassocks; breadboxes, cruets, altar crosses, processional crosses and candlesticks—there is no word about any of these persons or things to be found in the Prayer Book of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Our official directions for offering the Holy Sacrifice are very far from detailed. The text of the Holy Communion Service certainly presupposes an existing body of ceremonial knowledge and custom. Take for example "The Priest shall then offer, and shall place upon the Holy Table, the Bread and the Wine." Are we to offer the two elements at the same time, as in certain of the current Latin uses, or are we to offer them separately, as in the current Roman Missal? There is excellent Roman authority for either use! What prayers are we to say while we offer? Or are we to follow the ancient custom of offering them by gesture, without formal prayer?

In vain do we search the Prayer Book for specific answers to these questions. Therefore it becomes necessary for sincere men to look elsewhere. The thing that makes a man a Roman Catholic is not the use of Roman ceremonial, but the formal and deliberate acceptance of the claim that the Bishop of Rome is the Vicar of Christ on earth. We now state our seventh and eighth principles: **THERE MAY BE A LEGITIMATE VARIETY IN CEREMONIAL**; and **A LOYAL ANGLICAN PRIEST MAY CERTAINLY USE THOSE DEVOTIONS AND CEREMONIES WHICH**

ARE PART OF OUR HERITAGE AS WESTERN CHRISTIANS.

Perhaps it is a truism to state that Liturgy is a living thing, and changes from generation to generation. Certainly the ceremonial now generally used in our so-called "low" parishes was very daring a hundred years ago. Vested choirs, a weekly Eucharist, two candles and an altar cross, a priest vested in surplice and colored stole—these were the marks of an extreme parish in the eighteenth-fifties. The truth of the matter is that each generation makes its own contribution to the Prayer of the Church.

We have spent some time in thinking about those fundamental principles which should underlie our performance of divine worship. By now it shall be quite apparent that our subject is far more than a discussion of ecclesiastical etiquette. Our Eucharistic ceremonial is the manner in which we offer the holiest prayer mankind has ever known. Put in another way, everything said or done at the Altar is an integral part of the homage we offer to the divine Majesty. We pray not only with our hearts and minds, but with our lips, our eyes, our hands, our knees, our feet; in fact, with our whole being. It is true, no part of our corporate homage to the King of kings can be dismissed as "Mere Ceremonial."

Not long ago I was present at the Eucharist in a church where the carefully trained acolytes served so unobtrusively that the congregation was scarcely aware of their presence. The youths behaved themselves as men intent upon the King's Service. They knew that their every movement was an act of homage to Christ their King, and their behaviour reflected the teaching of a well-trained and disciplined pastor. It was indeed a great privilege to be in Church that morning.

Let me close with a personal memory of one of the great saints of the Church in this Country. I write saint with a small "s," but when the American Church gets around to Anglican Saints, I venture to predict that James Otis Sargent Huntington, Father Founder of the Order of the Holy Cross, will be so designated.

It was my privilege to spend the summer of 1927 at Holy Cross, studying under Father Huntington's direction. One hot July afternoon he cleared his throat and said,

“My son, you will one day be privileged to stand at God’s altar and offer the Holy Sacrifice. On your way to the altar, pray for grace so to celebrate the Holy Mysteries that God’s people may not see you, but our Lord Jesus Christ!”

Lord, evermore give us this grace.

Pray brethren, that we may so offer my Sacrifice and yours, that it may be acceptable to God the Father Almighty.

Four Illinois Prelates

A Rambling Discussion of Town-and-Country Origins*

WALTER C. KLEIN

If anything is less tolerable in ecclesiastics than affected gravity, it is affected levity. Professional clerical humor is a pathetic, and at the same time an abominable, thing. It is pathetic because it is a plea on the part of its perpetrator for acceptance as a human being in spite of his round collar and all the other tokens of his separation from the common run of mankind, and it is abominable because it seeks to raise a laugh by giving a vulgar turn to words that should be reserved for devout uses. Above all, it is offensive because it is pompous, and if we look searchingly we detect behind the pompous front an arrogant weakness that protects itself by taking advantage of such accidental things as position, status, and prestige. The successful cleric tends to be a smug humorist, and the unsuccessful cleric tends to be a snide humorist, but neither of them convinces us that he is a genuinely funny humorist. For authentic humor we have to go to the saints; their humor is humble, humane, and uncontrived. It never loses its freshness, and this cannot be said of

*Read at a town-and-country conference in Peoria, Illinois, on October 24, 1961. Grateful acknowledgment is due my former colleague, the Rev. Prof. Percy V. Norwood, for valuable bibliographical suggestions and much profitable conversation on the subject of the Episcopal Church in Illinois. My inaccuracies are strictly my own.

the other kind of humor, which is stale even at the first hearing.

This is admittedly a curious introduction to the history of the Episcopal Church in Illinois. Illinois is a flat state, and Episcopalians, whatever their private excesses, are known to be attached to a dignified mode of worship, which in the judgment of the uninstructed is as flat as the prairies themselves. There appears to be little chance for humor in the history of such a body in such a place, particularly if the record has mainly been committed to a succession of unexciting convention journals. Almost nothing here suggests humor.

Nevertheless humor abounds. Dr. Hopkins' *The Great Forty Years* is replete with diverting anecdotes. Dr. Barry's book *Impressions and Opinions*, a considerable part of which deals with Illinois, is funny in a sardonic way. Dr. Hopkins mentions a pungently annotated parish list produced in a season of exasperation by the rector of a church near Chicago, and this work, I am assured, is extant, though rarely exhibited. The supreme humorist is Dr. Clinton Locke, the author of *Personal Reminiscences of the Diocese of Illinois from the year 1856 to the year 1892*, a period piece preserved in typescript. This writer, with his Latin tags and his facetious biblical quotations, represents not only an era but also an attitude. The era has terminated, but the attitude persists. Dr. Locke's fellow humorists manifest the same attitude. It is an attitude shaped, so far as one can see, principally by "impressions and opinions," to use Dr. Barry's phrase. It would be unjust to say that convictions are totally excluded, but they are certainly not very prominent, and as time passes views gain ascendancy over beliefs and more and more certain things are held to be true not because one has to believe them, but because one likes to believe them. From an unconscious recognition of this gradual surrender to self springs the characteristic bitterness of Anglican clerical humor. Am I perhaps putting it too strongly? The possibility cannot be denied; yet in most of us an obscure malaise increases with age, and I suggest that it is the affliction of men who are no longer possessed by truth but rather think of themselves as its possessors and act as though their apostolic service were merely a contest with personal opponents. Some degree of that spirit can be discerned in Dr.

Locke and the other commentators (one can scarcely call them historiographers, much less historians), and indeed the spirit is inherent in the history itself. We cannot say that personalities have wholly absorbed issues and principles; we cannot say that human frailty has impeded the work of God here more than elsewhere; but we can say that personal character has often been decisive in the history of the Episcopal Church in Illinois—at all events, more decisive than it has ordinarily been in the older dioceses of the country. Illinois has had, in fact, some exceedingly robust personalities, and a few of these could probably not have flourished in any other part of the land.

Be that as it may, we shall now have to decide on a portion or an aspect of the history in question and confine ourselves to that; nothing else is possible in this strictly limited paper. Dr. Hopkins has done "The Great Forty Years" (1893-1934). The history of the last three decades cannot profitably be written until more time has elapsed. The span of Bishop Chase's episcopate (1835-1852), for all its charm and interest as a period of origins, exhibits a culture that is now extinct, although the pioneering bishop is a perennial example to town-and-country parsons. That leaves approximately forty years (1852-1893), and we shall refrain from trying to find a distinctive name for them. They are not "great" in Dr. Hopkins' sense of the adjective, nor are they petty, trivial, or mean. They are simply the years of certain important and conclusive developments in the country, the state, and (both generally and regionally) the church. In these years the country came to technological maturity and the countryside acquired the atmosphere in which the modern town-and-country specialist works. The crux of the church history of Illinois is the division of the original diocese in 1877. This was first proposed in the days of Bishop Whitehouse, some ten years before it actually happened. It was effected under Bishop McLaren, whose reduced jurisdiction, renamed the Diocese of Chicago in 1884, ultimately far outstripped the newer dioceses in personnel and resources. Bishop Burgess took charge of Quincy and Bishop Seymour of Springfield, and each in his own way brought a real diocese into being and by creative action set a course for his successors. All four of these prelates

were obedient servants of Providence, and as we contemplate their respective parts in the events of forty momentous years the pattern of those times becomes evident to us and we see its influence on all that follows. This, then, is our theme; and now to the details.

If at times there appears to be a conflict of interest between inner-city work and town-and-country work, it is perhaps salutary to note that Bishop Whitehouse, a highly civilized city-dweller, became Bishop of Illinois through the efforts of his predecessor, Bishop Chase, who was from first to last a son of the soil. It is a pity that their association was so brief, for each had something that Illinois vitally needed. Jubilee College was designed to exemplify and protect the distinctive values of a Christian rural life. The "bishop's church" in Chicago had a comparable purpose, but this purpose had to be realized in the setting of a pluralistic, expanding city. Both projects proved embarrassing to the Diocese of Illinois, and its reluctance to accept and foster them is a symptom of a certain indecision in face of Illinois' problems and opportunities. The transfer of episcopal authority from a patriarch to an executive may have put an excessive strain on the adaptability of the diocese, but the West was proud of its resourcefulness, and here was a good chance to exercise it. Bishop Whitehouse came into office just as the great rush of immigration was gathering force, and all through the era we here have in view four out of five immigrants were English, Irish, or German. To the second and third the Episcopal Church may pardonably have felt that it had no obvious mission, but this was not true of the English. Here, in any case, was a fluid situation, which the church in Illinois could resolutely have met, as its leaders repeatedly urged it to do, simply by being true to its apostolic and universal character. Instead, it elected to settle down to protracted partisan wrangling.

Bishop Chase was always falling off his horse or out of his buggy. This, so far as I know, was never held against him. Bishop Whitehouse had a similar fault: he was, or appeared to be, constantly taking the cars back to New York. This was vehemently resented. There was, indubitably, a great deal back East to attract the Bishop, especially in New York City, the scene of his birth, education, and most important priestly work and the home of his

family. The diocese certainly did not exert itself to make him comfortable in Chicago. While these awkward conditions continued, he commuted between the two metropolises and served his diocese in a manner that left it no reasonable cause for complaint. Complain, nevertheless, it did, and that with regrettable publicity. Driven at least once to the verge of resignation, the Bishop notwithstanding stuck it out. In the end he took up his residence in Chicago and so concluded one of the many arguments he carried on with elements in his jurisdiction.

A mere list of these disputes would extend beyond the confines we must observe. "Thank God, my hearers," sighs Doctor Locke, "that you did not live in those days of bitter and unchristian party spirit." The harassed prelate had to contend with the Pastoral Aid Society, a group of aggressive, disloyal low churchmen dedicated to the stultification of the Diocesan Missionary Society; the Chicago clergy, at one time solidly at odds with him; a clergyman charged with philandering; the Civil War; the Chicago Fire; and numerous other vexations. Although Bishop Whitehouse sometimes invited such troubles (there were doubtless a few who even blamed him for the War and the Fire) or when they came unsolicited, aggravated them, the bulk of the hostility sprang from an antipathy to a bishop who refused to minimize his office. A justice of the state supreme court declared, "No intelligent man can deny that the Episcopal Church is not in harmony with the broad Democracy of our people and institutions How, then, can it become a favorite Church with the body of our people?" The Bishop's retort to challenges of this type was the dignified affirmation of the central content of the Faith as this church receives it. A passage in his Lambeth sermon illustrates his splendid grasp of Christian truth and, incidentally, the ornate flourishes of his eloquence:

We stand in our unbroken line, witness by the same sacramental altars of eighteen centuries ago, confess in the same creeds, teach from the same inspired word, recognize the mystical spouse ever young and beautiful, and are folded to her breast as a dear and holy Mother; we find perpetuated in Christ's visible body, each function of its living organism, each

susceptibility of its complex being and individual experience, and encounter "the dangers and chances of the world" in the same conflict with the same suffering church. As we catch this single gush of heart-revealing it is fresh for us as a living spring to thirsty lip. We drink it in and then down among all our heart sickness and bewildered struggles, our wearying shame and spectral responsibility, where perhaps years have withered the flowers, and dried even perennial roots, *there* are we conscious of response to joy in sufferings This is an age of vigour, materialism, science, and breadth; this is an age of thrift, refinement, and liberty which quickens the individual to intense development and drives the mass with impassioned tread;—can we wonder that we of the Anglican Communion have the yearnings, the griefs, the temptations, the betrayals, the false purposes and misguided minds, the inadequate resources, all the indescribable conflicts which darken our atmosphere? Can we deny how much we deserve the rebuke, ridicule, and correction of the sharp world around us? Can we hush our sobs when we know in our poor experience how Christ is wounded in the house of His friends? Can we cheer ourselves in selfish gladness, when there is so much to be done, so much to be endured, and the strife seems so unequal with our shepherd sling? No, brothers, no; we bless God in our heart of hearts that He has poured around light and heat, even if it does quicken spawn of evil, if it does shame us in its brightness, and make us faint in its glow; you wish no change in the strife that tends not to victory, no higher honour than to gather the fragments of the sufferings of Jesus, no more sufficient consolation than the pledge which covers all infirmities and reaches our heart sins.

The thought is magnificent, and for its sake we can bear the language. A few years before Abraham Lincoln had said things almost as sublime in language that the most streamlined modern mind can tolerate. The estimable bishop possessed many gifts and a few defects. The quality we most miss in his discourses is simplicity of mind and purpose, and when he was not consciously making

a speech he could talk simply, too. This grace, unfortunately, deserted him the moment he became aware of his auditors. He was awed by the bishops at the Lambeth Conference of 1867 and tried too hard to be worthy of the occasion. His sermon, subtle and perceptive in its exegesis, made a poor impression on two of the English bishops and probably bored them all. As one reads it, one realizes that a number of homiletical clichés are older than one imagined. His lordship of Illinois suffered from an inability to calculate the "effect," as Dr. Locke says, of the words he spoke and the postures he assumed. Hence his distressing verbosity and his fumbling tactics in ecclesiastical combat. For all his distinction and deep sensitivity, he blundered in human relations. He was, if we may be allowed one little cliché, a statesman and not a politician. Learned, indefatigable, energetic, disciplined, gracious, and superior to the weakness, meanness, and self-pity that mar many a Christian life, Henry John Whitehouse carried himself like the patrician he was in a city that did not easily recognize patricians. His blameless conduct and complete integrity redeemed whatever mistakes he made. He reminds one of Woodrow Wilson.

Bishop Whitehouse had more political strength south of Chicago than in the city itself. Therefore it was little less than heroic of him to assent as readily as he did to the growing opinion in favor of the division of the diocese. The matter was probably never wholly out of his mind during the closing years of his life. He addressed the thirty-third annual convention of the Diocese of Illinois (1870) on the subject, reviewing and criticizing several schemes of partition and betraying a certain indecision on his own part as to the best way to draw the lines. Originally the Bishop contemplated two approximately equal dioceses. The line would have run a little south of Bloomington. The cities of Quincy and Springfield would have been in the southern diocese. However, the Bishop suggested a second possibility: "The third diocese might then comprehend the area lying west of the Illinois river to its junction with the Mississippi; and with its northern boundary on the south line of Mercer, Henry, and Bureau counties." Thus there would have been a Diocese of Peoria, with a cathedral at Jubilee, and a Diocese of Springfield, the latter eventually to be

divided into a northern part and a southern part. Later the Bishop advocated the division of the state into three east-to-west belts, which we may call respectively Chicago, Peoria, and Springfield, the last in his view subject to further division. Manifestly this was not the moment to proceed with the partition. Still, the necessity of it was plain enough: Ohio with a population only a trifle larger than Illinois' had two dioceses, and so had Wisconsin, which claimed about two-fifths as many inhabitants as were recorded for Illinois.

The question was still unresolved in 1874, the year of Bishop Whitehouse's death. For a time the diocese was so occupied with the election of a new head that it could not spare a thought for partition. First Dean Seymour of the General Theological Seminary was elected, but the necessary ratification was denied him. Dr. DeKoven was then elected, and his consecration was similarly blocked. Never was vindictive partisanship lower or more reprehensible. The third priest chosen, William Edward McLaren, obtained the requisite approval, and Illinois finally had a bishop.

It speedily became evident that Divine Wisdom had overruled the myopic maneuvers of factions and cliques. Whatever interests his supporters may have imagined they were safeguarding by voting for him, the third Bishop of Illinois soon demonstrated that he was anything but a party hack. Some had reservations on account of his sectarian past. Others drew a premature reassurance from the same source. The Bishop confounded both groups by being himself, and an extraordinary bishop he was! As industrious and accomplished as Bishop Whitehouse, he far surpassed the departed diocesan in his sense of the right step to take and the right way to take it. His tactful, patient realism reduced diocesan friction, and when people became accustomed to him a new contentment and friendliness prevailed. His moments of vanity and touchiness are remembered in anecdote mainly because they were not typical. He spoke admirably, but without the rhetorical elaborations to which Bishop Whitehouse had been so addicted. He loved the Church for what he had discovered her to be, and his conversion had been a radical experience. He was a true Christian, a true Anglican, and a true bishop. His knowledge of ascetical theology

added immensely to the depth and usefulness of his ministry. He wrote on the interior life, promoted retreats, and showed his clergy how to cultivate spirituality. The diocese, weary of the dissension that had retarded its development, accepted his leadership and began to grow.

The Dioceses of Springfield and Quincy commenced their separate existence in 1877. There were formalities of course, but years of discussion had produced substantial agreement, and with the consent and cooperation of Bishop McLaren old bonds were severed and presently Illinois had three bishops instead of one. The three dioceses now made an attempt to perpetuate their ties in a quasi-provincial union of the kind permitted by the General Convention of 1868. The requisite local action was taken by 1880 and there the project bogged down. The organization of provinces had been proposed as early as 1850. They were belatedly authorized in 1901 in an article of the Constitution, and this article was implemented in 1913. The provinces that then came into being were far larger than the province once contemplated in the State of Illinois. Nobody is satisfied with the provinces we now have. It is regrettable that the Illinois plan, which had incontestable merits, was never given the trial it deserved. It might have facilitated the solution of some of the problems that have since arisen with economic and demographic fluctuations. As it is, Illinois can fairly claim to have furthered and guided the movement that eventually led to our present system of provinces.

The amicable detachment of so much territory from his diocese freed Bishop McLaren to apply himself to the improvement and expansion of what we now call "urban work." His cathedral was a pioneer among Anglican cathedrals in this country, and now some of the potentialities of the "bishop's church" were realized. Bishop McLaren looked upon it as an urban missionary center—a very logical view to take of it in that age of settlement houses and institutional churches. Individual enterprise reinforced diocesan policy. St. Luke's Hospital, long nourished by Grace Church, attained impressive size, and Dr. Tolman Wheeler founded Western Theological Seminary. While clinical training and team ministries had not as yet been conceived, the mission to the city

was prosecuted with intelligence and insight. The renowned Father Dolling's visit to Chicago a few years after the close of our period brought together the best slum priest of the times and one of the worst slum situations. What if he had chosen to stay? The cathedral, with its manifold activity, was precisely the sphere for a man like Dolling. There should have been some way of multiplying him.

Bishop McLaren was spared the fatigues of suburban work as we know it in our generation. Diocesan missions waxed and waned in a town-and-country environment. The best that the Bishop could do was to muddle through. Money was scarce, and so were competent men. In a private conversation with me directly after his retirement, Dr. Barry, the celebrated rector of St. Mary the Virgin, one of the most metropolitan of parishes, summarized the ineptitude of the Church with characteristic bluntness. "Any fool," he exclaimed, "can run St. Mary's, but it takes the best men in the Church's service to run the little places." This is sober fact, and until the Church recognizes it, town-and-country work will not be what it ought to be. For the town-and-country ministry nothing short of the best in personnel will do.

Let us conclude with a quick review of what Bishops Seymour and Burgess were about in their respective dioceses. In his initial address to the convention of Springfield almost a year after his consecration George Franklin Seymour did the most disarming thing he could have done. As all sincere missionaries do, he identified himself with the locality to which he had been called. These were his words: "I feel myself already in many respects a Western man; the lesson of adapting myself to new phases of life is now more than half learned, and under your considerate and attractive tuition I shall soon become so thoroughly assimilated to your ways and methods and tastes that you will forget that your Bishop is an importation from the great city of the East." Undaunted he told the diocese simply and resolutely what had to be done: "It often, nay, it usually, happens that in just such proportion as a man needs the Gospel in such proportion is he indifferent to it, or opposed to its being brought to his home and heart. Hence, at the outset of missionary enterprise the few must provide for the many, and with us it is the very few for the very many. Let us face the fact,

dear brethren, bravely and frankly; we are among the poorest, if not the poorest, Diocese in Christendom." Hostility and apathy must be confronted with a full presentation of the Faith, and if the effect was disappointing, the failure must be accepted.

To these and other fundamental considerations the Bishop recurred in his subsequent addresses. The diocese was vast, and for every one of its inhabitants who was a communicant of the Holy Catholic Church there were almost a thousand who were not. This simply stimulated the Bishop to more prodigious exertions. When the adversaries of the Church screamed "Popery!" he hurled back at them all the erudition he had accumulated as Professor of Ecclesiastical History at The General Theological Seminary. When his people were niggardly, he recommended that they tithe. He was an unyielding apostle, but neither a harsh pastor nor a tedious teacher. If he said the same things many times, he did not always say them in the same language.

The results were very creditable. From 1879 to 1886 the number of communicants nearly doubled. By any criterion the diocese was doing exceedingly well. The thriving state of the work can be ascribed more to positive, consistent, persuasive teaching than to anything else. The Bishop knew what the Catholic Church believed, and no manner of pressure could have made him teach anything else. We are therefore not surprised to discover that he was one of the early supporters of a still unvictorious cause. "It was our privilege," he reported to the Synod of 1886, "to move in the House of Bishops to strike out the words 'Protestant Episcopal' from the title page of the Prayer Book, and although the motion did not then prevail, still there is good ground for hope that the much needed reform will ere long be accomplished."

Samuel S. Harris, rector of St. James', Chicago, elected bishop at the Primary Convention of the Diocese of Quincy, declined, and at a special convention the two orders concurred in the choice of Alexander Burgess, rector of Christ Church, Springfield, Mass., who accepted. Like his brother of Springfield, Bishop Burgess was a stranger to these parts, but this did not keep him from rushing to his diocese immediately after his consecration. His address to the

first convention sounds rather breathless, and certainly one who had been through so much in so short a time had a right to be a bit winded. Having barely got off the train, the Bishop could not hazard any very concrete declarations of policy. He circumspectly confined himself to generalities, and they were the eternal generalities of the Catholic Church. In his own accents and with his own stresses he pointed out to his diocese the proper aims of Christian action. He and Bishop Seymour had identical purposes. As becomes new bishops they concentrated on their irreducible obligations.

Whereas Springfield had too much territory, Quincy had too few people and those it had often seemed merely to be in transit. The consequences for the Church were disquieting. "It results," stated the Bishop in 1880, "that there are few places, not now occupied, in which the population is so large or changeable, that priests can be settled in them with good hope of speedily getting congregations." The Bishop appealed for diocesan missionaries. People must not be allowed to forget the Church. Where services could not be held every Sunday they should be held as often as the missionary's schedule permitted. This procedure undeniably had apostolic precedent, but it led to no spectacular gains in Quincy. Yet fortitude and heroic toil produced some increase, and since this is all that God was pleased to grant, it is not for us to depreciate it. Bishop Burgess remained in the field against odds that frightened off scores of lesser clergy. That alone gives him honor and stature among town-and-country men.

In sketching these four founders we have contemplated the church life of Illinois from the top. Viewed from the bottom it looks much the same. C. H. Swartzbaugh, the historian of the Episcopal Church in Fulton County, Illinois, makes a penetrating analysis of "the problems . . . of diocesan boundaries, a decreasing population, two decades of non-resident clergy and the ineffectiveness of the church's program of education and evangelism" The same author tells us that Canton, Illinois had forty clergymen between 1835 and 1958. These are the perpetual griefs, if not grievances, of our town-and-country bishops. What worries such

bishops most is the dearth of suitable personnel. When Bishop Burgess laments, "But the priests, willing for such mission tasks, are few. Those adapted for them are fewer still," he is the mouth-piece of a multitude of bishops. Are we going to let them wait forever?

Inaugural Sermon

Delivered at Nashotah
House, October 26, 1961

THE REV. WILFORD O. CROSS

If ye love me keep my commandments

Anyone who is inclined to take the New Testament at its face value is in for a considerable shock when he meets a type of Christianity that uses the word "legalism" for any interpretation of the New Testament that assumes that our Lord taught anything about human conduct. Most of us read the Sermon on the Mount and other teachings of our Lord and assume that in some way, however clothed in oriental parable and hyperbole, He was telling us something about the Will of God for human living. At the close of the Sermon on the Mount there occur the words:

Everyone then who heareth these words of mine and doeth them will be likened to a wise man who built his house upon a rock.

The term that is usually used for the tradition in Christianity that says that Christianity is a religion without ethical and moral commandments is Antinomianism. Antinomianism, or antagonism to law or ethical directive, has been a frequent tendency that has cropped up in Christianity. Some of the texts of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, if lifted out of context, can readily be used to support this kind of reductionism. "The letter killeth but the spirit giveth life" is one of these. Montanism, despite its rigid asceticism, encouraged antinomian attitudes because of its reliance

upon the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit. Much later Joachim of Flora, with his doctrine of the spiritual man and the Age of the Holy Spirit, began an antinomian tradition that had a long history. Joachim influenced the Fraticelli, the unconventional Franciscans, and through them the mystical cults of late medievalism, and these in turn helped to breed the radical antinomianism of the Ana-baptists, which broke out in polygamy and cannibalism at Munster, and finally fathered more gentle antinomian groups like the Mennonites and the Quakers.

With the coming of pietism in the 18th century and movements in America like New Side Congregationalism and New Light Presbyterianism, and the Great Awakening, and movements on the Continent like Moravianism and movements in England like Wesleyanism, a new kind of antinomianism came about. This might rather crudely be called the antinomianism of the sawdust trail. In essence it taught that any kind of moral teaching was vain. The effective way to change lives was to produce the twice-born man. Conversion experiences penetrated to the roots of the moral life, while years of ethical instruction and commandment had little effect. John Wesley himself did not subscribe to this type of antinomianism, but many in the current of this emotional movement, which was a psychological parallel to the sentimental and romantic movement in literature, did. Sometimes this type of antinomianism was concomitant, illogically, with the teaching of a very rigid, somewhat trivial ethical code quite remote from the New Testament . . . a good man is one who does not play cards, smoke nor drink intoxicants.

Historically then, we have two types of antinomianism, one that replaces moral directive with the indwelling, inner light of the Holy Spirit, and the second type replacing moral directive by any inner, psychological experience of a highly emotional character.

There is some value, of course, to what antinomianism is saying. It could not have persisted as a kind of fringe tradition in Christianity if it had not some substance of truth. What antinomianism points to, really, is the subjective goal of all ascetical theology. Ascetical theology teaches that in the growth in grace and spiritual sensitivity that it understands to be the path of the

spiritual life, by long discipline and meditation, one can arrive at holiness. This is the goal of every Christian. When holiness is achieved the commandments of ordinary morality, of moral law, become unnecessary, for a certain habitual spontaneity has replaced the need for moral discipline. The Saint is so saturated by divine charity that spelling out the will of God in large letters for spiritual children is no longer needed. This, of course, is Joachim's spiritual man, in whom the gifts of the Spirit have borne the fruit of Holy Wisdom. A great moral theologian like Jeremy Taylor is, of course, aware of that; he knows the precepts of moral theology and that the moral life is but an adjunct to the spiritual life. This is the dislocated truth which the antinomian tradition has preserved.

I have spoken of historical forms of Antinomianism, but it would be a mistake to regard antinomian tendencies as a matter of history. Only five or six years ago when the Seabury Series made their first appearance they were characterized by an antagonism to teaching morality to children. The theory seemed to be that it made them feel guilty. One should not tell them how to be decent human beings but accept them as they were. Morality was a form of judgment and of rejection. All this was made very plausible by a jargon terminology and many people did not see that by this radical antinomianism the Church had officially abrogated its traditional role as the moulder and nurse of the moral conscience. The Offices of Instruction should have been torn out of the Prayer Book because they produce guilty feelings by such phrases as "to keep my hands from picking and stealing."

The background of this sudden outcropping of radical antinomianism was not altogether the educational theory of acceptance and rejection, but it had a theological background as well. It had roots in the various developments of Crisis Theology. Here the antinomianism of Pietism was reproduced. Ethical conduct grew not so much out of training, indoctrination, habit-forming, as out of the Kierkegaardian leap, a somewhat unsawdusty and sophisticated version of the conversion experience. This refurbished antinomianism, however, is also complicated by a radical personalism which says that each man is unique and every situation is unique and that ethics and morality therefore are abstractions. It

is interesting that St. Thomas said that too, but that didn't keep him from thinking that a moral theology was all the more valuable to give some general lines of guidance to unique persons and particular situations. Every spot on the earth's surface is unique but no navigator has by that argument felt he could dispense with latitude and longitude.

We find also, today, in Protestant circles an antinomianism of love. This also contains a tremendous truth. Charity is the mother of all the virtues, St. Thomas teaches. This is because charity, and its sister, natural love, are virtues of the will. As such they are the motivating force, the dynamic of conduct. Love is an energy, a motivating psychological energy.

It is not an indulgence, I think, in metaphysics but an appeal to the most common experience to say that one of the most recurring facts of the universe in which we live is that energies must have structures through which they work. Steam is a diffuse thing until it is led into a cylinder to push a piston. We are told that the stuff of matter is electrical energy but no beings exist until this underlying energy gets itself into a pattern, a relationship of negative and positive electricity, so that atoms are born. Every energy requires a structure. This is psychologically true, also, of the attitudes, the desires, the passions, the energies of the will. And a psychic energy like love needs a pattern or structure into which it can pour itself. Love, in short, needs the channels of justice, through which it can become effective. Justice without love is a sterile legalism, but love without justice is diffuse. Love requires the pattern of law, directive, commandment.

The relationship is incarnational and sacramental. Energy is poured into structure. An illustration that might make this clear is what psychologists used to call the "instinct" of mother-love. In many animals the care of offspring can safely be left to this instinct most of the time, but in human beings the reflex chain of instinctual behaviour is broken. It is in between the fragmented instinctual patterns that we reason and experiment and improvise. Mother-love, therefore, has to be augmented by intelligence and experience and books have to be written on the care and feeding of infants, or else grandmother has to arrive on the scene. People

have to be taught the best ways to love children. The love of neighbor that the Good Samaritan manifested was patterned into acts of helpfulness. He didn't just sit on the bank and love.

To go back to our text . . . "If ye love me keep my commandments" . . . the commandments will tell you how to love. The motivating power that is love is made intelligent, effective, operative by finding within law and commandment divinely appointed ways to love. And so the Psalmist says, "With my whole heart have I sought thee; O let me not go wrong out of thy commandments."

"If ye love me, keep my commandments."

Seminary News

BIBLE SUNDAY

Bible Sunday was observed at Nashotah House with a movie on modern Bible translations and a special sermon at evensong. The preacher was Mr. E. Raymond Sims of the Middle Class, whose sermon had been awarded a prize of twenty-five dollars by a faculty committee. Mr. Sims discussed the question: What is the Bible? He made four affirmations about the Bible: it is a promise of redemption; it is a light for human life; it is concerned with The Person of Jesus Christ; and it is a witness. We quote the end of his sermon, which was remarkable throughout for its evangelical fervor:

When the Word of God is faithfully presented, I think the miracle will begin to take place. As the African translator expressed it, "This book speaks to my heart." So those to whom we present it will hear God speaking to them.

Today I think we have something to say after we have been confronted with God's Word and have committed ourselves to its claims; and we *need* to say it to people who *need* to hear it, and in such terms that they will readily know what we are talking about.

You and I as witnesses to the redeeming Word not only have something to say to people, but we have the divine imperative: we *must* say it, if we would save their souls and ours!

THE DECADE OF DEVELOPMENT

Nashotah House is most happy to announce the pledge of one hundred thousand dollars by Christ Church, Whitefish Bay, Wisconsin. The Diocese of Milwaukee has pledged two hundred thousand dollars to the Decade of Development. The Decade of Development is a fund-raising drive on which the seminary has just embarked in an effort to raise five million dollars over the next ten years.

OPEN HOUSE

On the last Sunday in October, Nashotah House held open house to extend to the people of the surrounding dioceses some measure of hospitality in return for the many favors extended the House by its friends. Though the weather was very poor, more than 500 attended. At least four of the surrounding dioceses were represented by the guests. A number of activities and displays had been prepared for the visitors as well as a musical program. Tours were given of the grounds and buildings, and refreshments were served by the wives of seminarians. The Very Rev. Walter C. Klein was preacher at Evensong. Because of the success of the open house, plans are already being made for one next fall. The date will be October 14, 1962.

ONEIDA INDIANS

In October, we were pleased to have as guests of the House a group of Oneida Indians from the church of the Holy Apostles, Oneida, Wisconsin. They attended Evensong and presented, after dinner, a program of the history of the Oneidas interspersed with hymns sung in the Oneida language.

COMMENCEMENT 1962

Tuesday, May 22, Alumni Lecture

The Rev. Darwin Kirby, Jr., Rector

St. George's Church, Schenectady, N. Y.

Thursday, May 24, Commencement Preacher

The Rt. Rev. Lauriston L. Scaife,

The Bishop of Western New York.

SEABURY - WESTERN VISIT

About fifty students and their wives from Seabury-Western were guests of Nashotah House on Saturday, November 4. The highlight of the day was a football game between the two seminaries. Nashotah was the victor with a score of 44 to 0. The Seabury-Western students and wives were guests for lunch and dinner.

OUR NEW BURSAR

The administration of Nashotah House is pleased to announce the appointment of Mr. Felix Beauchamp as Bursar. His appointment will take effect on March 15. Mr. Beauchamp is retiring from the Quaker Oats Company. Mr. and Mrs. Beauchamp will live on the third floor of Bishop Webb Hall. Their son, the Rev. Douglas Beauchamp, is a graduate of Nashotah House of the class of 1954.

ANNUAL RETREAT

The Nashotah House annual retreat will be conducted by The Very Rev. John E. Gulick, Dean, St. Paul's Cathedral, Fond du Lac. The retreat will be from March 12 to March 16.

CONFERENCE ON URBAN WORK

From June 4 to 8 a conference designed especially for clergy new to Urban Work will be held at Nashotah House. Seminarians are welcome. Faculty and Curriculum:

Theology and Liturgy in the Inner City, The Rev. C. Kilmer Myers, S.T.D.

Working in the Inner City Parish, The Very Rev. Paul Moore, Jr., S.T.D.

The Social Dynamics of the Metropolis, Mr. Perry Norton, Sociologist.

Evening Seminars, under the direction of Canon Frank H. V. Carthy.

Seminar Subjects:

The Church and the Social Work Community

Christian Social Action

Christian Education in the Inner City

Registration fee is \$2.00. Fee for conference (includes registration fee) \$15.00.

THE DEAN VISITS FLORIDA

The Very Rev. Walter C. Klein was in Florida from January 11 to January 22 talking to various groups and preaching. He visited churches at Coral Gables, Clear Water, Lakeland, Miami, Miami Beach, Orlando, and Coconut Grove. Dean Klein said it was a very successful trip.

EPIPHANY PARTIES

On Thursday, January 4, wives of the faculty and students were invited to the refectory for the annual Epiphany family night dinner. A group of students provided musical entertainment.

On Saturday, January 6, the Epiphany Children's party, planned by the wives, was held in the gymnasium. Games and entertainment added to the general merriment of the occasion.

SUMMER GRADUATE SCHOOL

The third annual session of the Nashotah House Graduate Summer School will open July 30 and will end September 1, 1962. Regularly enrolled graduate students receive two graduate credits for each course in which they have attended the lectures, done the assigned work, and passed the examination. Those who intend to earn credit should apply for admission to graduate studies. A form will be sent on request.

The following courses are being offered during the summer of 1962:

"The Other Gods," The Very Rev. Walter C. Klein, Ph.D., Th.D.

"The Church of the Fathers," The Rev. Imri M. Blackburn, Ph.D.

"Some Types of Christology: Ancient and Modern," The Rev. William H. Dunphy, Ph.D., S.T.D.

"Music in Worship and Ministry," The Rev. Robert L. Jacoby, B.D.

FATHER EATON

The Rev. J. Paul Eaton, Curate and Director of Religious Education at Christ Church, Whitefish Bay, joins the Nashotah Faculty for the second semester as a lecturer in Christian Education. He is also teaching a seminar in adult education. Father Eaton, a 1957 graduate of The House, has served as Vicar of Trinity Church, Gladstone, Michigan, and Zion Church, Wilson, Michigan before attaining his present position.

THE GROUNDS

Several gifts this fall have enabled us to begin the process of beautifying the grounds, especially with spring and early summer flowers. We have received several dozen bulbs and some flowering bushes including magnolias, flowering crabs and forsythia. More will be needed by spring and we are hoping for gifts from people's gardens.

HOUSE PREACHERS

Guest preachers for the second semester include:

The Rev. Richard P. Kirchen, Rector, St. John Chrysostom, Delafield, Wisconsin; January 25.

The Rev. Ronald E. Ortmyer, Rector, Holy Trinity Church, Janesville, Wisconsin; February 1.

The Rev. Paul Z. Hoornstra, Rector, Grace Church, Madison, Wisconsin; February 8.

The Rev. Sanford Garner, Rector, St. Matthew's Church, Kenosha, Wisconsin; February 15.

The Rev. William C. Norvell, Rector, St. Christopher's Church, River Hills, Wisconsin; February 22.

The Rev. Charles T. Gaskell, Rector, St. Mark's Church, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; March 1.

The Rev. Paul S. Kramer, Prof. of Systematic Theology, Seabury-Western Theological Seminary; April 26.

The Rev. Kenneth E. Trueman, Rector, Christ Church, La Crosse, Wisconsin; May 3.

The Very Rev. Gordon E. Brant, Dean, Christ Church Cathedral, Eau Claire, Wisconsin; May 10.

The Very Rev. Walter C. Klein is the preacher for Ash Wednesday and Thursdays in Lent.

VISITORS

Visitors at Nashotah House this academic year include the following:

The Rt. Rev. Trevor Huddleston, Bishop of the Diocese of Masasi.

The Rev. Kenneth Heim, Japan representative of the Overseas Department of the National Council.

The Most Rev. Joost de Blank, Archbishop of Capetown.

The Rt. Rev. Stephen C. Neill.

The Rev. James R. Allen, St. Michael's Farm for Boys, Picayune, Miss.



The Rev. J. Paul Eaton



*The Rev. Ell
Humphrey Creviston*



*The Rev. Richard
Fay Hulburt*

Obituaries

ELL HUMPHREY CREVISTON '26

The Rev. Ell Humphrey Creviston, retired Senior Canon of All Saints' Cathedral, Milwaukee, died suddenly on Sunday afternoon, October 29, in Milwaukee, at the age of 73.

The funeral took place the following Tuesday morning, with the Burial Office read by the Dean of the Cathedral, and the Lesson by Canon George White. The Requiem was a Sung Mass with the Dean-Emeritus Father Maynard as Celebrant. Assistants were young priests, three of them former members of the Cathedral congregation and graduates of Nashotah House, Fathers Radtke, Kephart, and Kirchen. Also assisting was Father Robert Brown as Crucifer. The Cathedral Choir sang the music of the Mass and a singularly appropriate motet. Some forty of the diocesan Clergy were in attendance, and vested, as well as a good sized congregation. The service concluded with the Absolution of the Body. Interment was in Peoria, Illinois, where Mass was offered in St. Andrew's Church, and home-town friends were present.

A convert from Methodism, Canon Creviston as a layman had valuable business experience as well as doing his share of military service in World War I. Entering Nashotah House as a Candidate for Holy Orders in 1921, he attended the College Department then in existence, and afterwards was graduated from the Seminary, in 1926. Priesthood the same year by Bishop Fawcett of Quincy, his early labors in the Priesthood were in mission work in the Diocese of Quincy centering in Canton, Illinois. In 1931 he came to Milwaukee to the Cathedral, to be a curate under Dean Drake, and subsequently served under this Dean and three Bishops, being made Senior Canon by Bishop Ivins, whose secretary Father Creviston had been when a student at Nashotah. Between these two men there was a lasting friendship and sincere appreciation.

During his long years at the Cathedral, the Canon earned the love of all in the congregation and the deep appreciation of those under whom he exercised his ministry. He retired in 1959. In the Diocese, Canon Creviston held a number of important positions, both appointive and elective. Among his successful operations at the Cathedral was the series of U. S. O. parties held on Sunday evenings for several years during World War II. He served for many years as Chaplain of his Legion Post, and for the year 1960 as Chaplain of the Wisconsin Department of the American Legion. Among other social interests was membership in the Fire Bell Club and the Knights of the Round Table. He also had Masonic affiliations.

Friends speak of him as a devoted priest who always helped them with words of real wisdom in their problems; who spoke ill of no one and who had a good word for all; fond of telling good stories and visiting in true fellowship with those about him; who in his life expressed joy in his sacred office; and if ever there came in his life disappointment through others, never showed the least bitterness.

RICHARD FAY HULBURT '49

The Rev. Richard F. Hulburt died Saturday, December 16, 1961 in Hallowell, Maine after a brief illness.

Father Hulbert was a veteran of World War II, an outstanding athlete in Beloit College and active in Stateline Scouting affairs.

He was born July 5, 1925 in Beloit and married Joan Williams of Park Ridge, Illinois in 1952.

A graduate of Beloit High School in 1943, Father Hulburt enlisted in the Air Force Reserve, and was called to active duty September 12, 1943. In March of the following year he was appointed an aviation cadet and in March 1945, after completing pilot training, was commissioned a Second Lieutenant.

He continued his education at Beloit College, graduating in 1949 with a Bachelor of Arts degree. Father Hulburt studied at Nashotah House from September, 1949 to June, 1952. He was ordained a deacon at St. Paul's Church in Beloit on July 20, 1952,

and the following month was assigned to St. Andrew's Church in Monroe and St. Michael's Church in Shullsburg, Wisconsin. In December, 1952, he was ordained to the priesthood at St. Matthias' Church in Waukesha by Bishop Hallock.

After serving his Monroe pastorate for $4\frac{1}{2}$ years, Father Hulburt received a call to St. Matthew's Church, Hallowell, Maine. There he was active in civic affairs and served mission churches in nearby communities.

At the Solemn Requiem Mass at Hallowell, Maine, the Bishop of the Diocese of Maine, The Rt. Rev. Oliver L. Loring officiated. The body was then sent to Beloit, Wisconsin, for burial at the East Lawn Cemetery, the Rev. William A. Johnson, formerly of St. Paul's, Beloit, officiating. Father Hulburt is survived by a wife and four children.

